

**New Hampshire Special Education**

**Onsite Evaluation Report**

**Final Copy**

**School Administrative Unit # 43**

**Evaluation conducted on December 18-19, 1995**

**Superintendent: Dr. Liz Durocher**

**Team Members:**

Jane Bergeron-Beaulieu, Chairperson  
Jean Brown  
Jan Stevens  
Tracy Morley  
Amy Bateman  
Donna Smart  
Diane Johnson  
Pauline Laliberte  
Liz Duff  
JoEllen Divoll  
Joe Denning  
Michael Harris

# **New Hampshire Special Education**

## **Onsite Evaluation Report**

I. Introduction:

II. Status of Corrective Actions from previous on-site:

III. Issues of Significance:

IV: Citations to the New Hampshire State Standards for Special Education:  
(Commendations, Citations, and Suggestions per school)

Note: It should be noted that suggestions are not considered corrective actions and therefore are given as technical assistance. The district is not mandated to implement them.

## **SAU # 43**

### **I. INTRODUCTION:**

A New Hampshire Special Education On-Site Evaluation was conducted at SAU #43 comprised of the following schools: Newport Middle High School, Towle Elementary, Richards Elementary, Sunapee Central, Goshen/Lempster Elementary, Sunapee High School and the Preschool Special Needs Programming. The on-site team met on December 18-19, 1995 in order to review the status of Special Education services being provided to eligible students.

Activities related to this evaluation included the close review of all the teaching certifications of Special Education Staff, analyzing of SPEDIS data, and random inspection of student records. Interviews were held with the Special Education Director, building principals, regular and special education teachers and related service personnel, as time and availability permitted. Throughout the visit the team had full cooperation from the school personnel and this helpfulness was greatly appreciated.

The report which you are about to read represents the consensus of all the members of your on-site team. Please keep in mind that this is a "report for exception", meaning that only exceptions to the N.H. State Standards have been addressed. If a component is not mentioned, that does not mean that the team did not review it; it just means that there were no exceptions to the Standards found in that particular area.

### **II. STATUS OF PREVIOUS ON-SITE: (May 1992)**

Upon review of the 1992 on-site evaluation report, as well as application materials submitted for the 1995 visit, it was the consensus of the visiting team that much effort has been put forth by all staff in the SAU to resolve issues of non-compliance noted during the 1992 visit. Upon visiting each of the schools in the SAU, the team determined that the 1992 citations noted as non-compliant have been nearly resolved. Still in process of being addressed is the need to improve record keeping and documentation of the special education process for students placed out of district. Of special note is the fact that SAU #43 has not only taken corrective action on many of the previous citations, but they have followed through with several of the suggestions made in terms of program improvement and compliance documentation.

Overall, SAU #43 has made significant gains in addressing the citations of the previous on-site and they are commended for their efforts. It is evident that much hard work continues to be put forth by the entire staff to ensure the quality and degree of compliance found in each building.

### **III. ISSUES OF SIGNIFICANCE:**

As the visiting team carried out its activities, a few issues of major significance surfaced. The first issue that surfaced was related to staff development opportunities and the need to strengthen professional growth activities made available to all staff, including paraprofessionals, teachers, and administrators. It was the consensus of the visiting team that SAU #43 has a strong commitment to provision of services for students in the least restrictive environment, yet there does not appear to be a clear vision or understanding of inclusionary practices. There is no philosophy or definition of inclusion that all staff have embraced or can clearly articulate and there has been no long term, on-going training in this area. If the inclusion model is to be successful, it will be necessary that all staff in SAU #43 be provided with the necessary support and training in areas such as modifying curriculum, team teaching, supervision of paraprofessionals and instructional techniques that support and augment the inclusion model.

The second issue identified by the team was staff certification and qualifications of service providers. As outlined in the report that follows, SAU #43 currently employs two individuals to provide psychotherapy to students yet these therapists have no New Hampshire licensure or certification with the NH Department of Education. In addition, the team noted that there is an immediate need to have those staff in the SAU responsible for EH programming obtain categorical endorsements in this area, or that these individuals be

### **III. ISSUES OF SIGNIFICANCE: (con't)**

supervised by an EH endorsed person on a regular basis. It was further noted by the team that there is currently no staff person in the SAU who holds the M.R. endorsement, therefore making it impossible to ensure that evaluation teams have appropriate membership in the identification of students with cognitive impairments.

The last issue raised by the team surrounds the role of the SAU related service personnel and their relationship with each school. Overall, this was the opinion of the visiting team that related services offered from the SAU level are somewhat fragmented in their relationship with the local building teams. The on-site team recognized the quality of services made available, as well as the skill level of the staff providing the services, yet there does not appear to be coordination and a vision for this team. The SAU needs to collectively deal with this issue to clarify direction, and to ensure involvement at the building level.

Overall, what the visiting team saw was a wide array of services being made available to all students. At this time there are many praiseworthy things happening in SAU #43 in both regular and special education programming and it has taken much effort and input from all staff, administrators and the community to make these programs work. The visiting team would like to recognize and support SAU #43 for their dedication and continued efforts to provide quality programming for all children.

#### **IV. COMMENDATIONS, CITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS**

##### **COMMENDATIONS: SAU WIDE**

- In each district within the SAU there is a sense of teamwork and cooperation among staff.
- In each school, the principals are actively involved in special education programming.
- Staff throughout the SAU were consistently described as skilled and dedicated with a genuine concern for all students.
- The special education director is an asset to the SAU, her leadership skills are well recognized and valued by staff.
- Parents interviewed via phone were supportive and pleased with services made available to all students.

##### **CITATIONS:**

<u>ED # 1119.07(a)</u>	<u>Qualification of Service Providers</u> 2 Psychotherapists providing services for students hold no licensure in Hampshire. The teachers assigned to the EH programs have no endorsement in this area. There is no staff member endorsed in MR
<u>ED # 1119.05(b,5)</u>	<u>Class Size/Age Range</u> The multi-occupations program in Newport exceeds age limits as outlined in the state standards.
<u>ED #1119.03(c)</u>	<u>Curriculum</u> For special education programs identified as self contained, there is no written curriculum developed. (i.e. the Multi-occupations Program)
<u>ED # 1129.05 (c)</u> <u>1107.03 (i)</u> <u>1129.05(a,2,4)</u>	<u>SPEDIS, Evaluation, Placement</u> Review of the SPEDIS print out indicated that approximately 8 students have overdue evaluations, 3 students are without current placements or discharge, and 3 students whose placement meeting is out of compliance.

**SUGGESTIONS:** NONE

**SCHOOL:**                      ***SAU #43 Preschool***

**PROGRAM(S):**            (1) Community Preschools            (2) Headstart

**SPEDIS # OF FILES:**    (1) 545424            (2) 554585

**COMMENDATIONS:**

- There is great communication between all staff members (including public and private).
- Transitional activities for Kindergarten are excellent.
- The special needs preschool has extremely high quality programs based on the inclusion model.
- Staff utilizes a great deal of parent involvement.
- Extremely good planning strategies are evident.
- All related services are delivered in the classroom which is commendable.
- Computers in each program are helpful in addressing IEP goals.
- Staff are commended for innovative development of IEP goals and objectives.
- There is effective use of dollars to coordinate public and private programs.
- Program coordinator is highly skilled.
- Facilities are well maintained with a pleasant atmosphere.

**CITATIONS:**

ED # 1107.05(k)                      1 file did not have a signed extension for evaluation that was not conducted within timelines.

ED # 1109.01(c)                      3 IEP's lacked the extent that the child would be in regular class.

ED # 1115.04(b)                      3 files lacked evidence that LRE was discussed.

**SUGGESTIONS:**    The SAU needs to have a contingency plan for special needs students if a community preschool closes.

**SCHOOL:** *Richards Elementary (K-3)*

**PROGRAM(S):** Inclusion classrooms

**SPEDIS # OF FILES:** (1) 547488 (2) 536187 (3) 547466

**COMMENDATIONS:**

- Teachers believe all students are being successful in inclusion model.
- Physical space is abundant and used creatively. (ex: enrichment room, parent's room)
- Development of "houses/teams" of classes is unique, beneficial and effective.
- There is a positive feeling throughout the entire school.

**CITATIONS:**

ED # 1107.07(b,3) 1 file did not have an LEA representative.  
ED # 1107.08(a) LD file does not have a regular classroom teacher on evaluation team.

ED # 1111.01 1 file had no evidence of extended school year consideration.

**SUGGESTIONS:** None

**SCHOOL:** *Towle Elementary School*

**PROGRAM(S):** All

**SPEDES # OF FILES:** (1) 522619 (2) 549324 (3) 547492 (4) 532722

**COMMENDATIONS:**

- Staff are very committed to inclusionary practices.
- Cooperation level between regular education and special education is commendable.
- There is excellent administrative support; the principal is very committed to and pleased with her staff.

**CITATIONS:**

<u>ED # 1107.02(b)</u>	2 files had no Written Prior Notice.
<u>ED # 1107.02(d)</u>	2 files had no written notice to parents of the disposition.
<u>ED # 1107.07(b)</u>	1 file had no LEA representative other than the teacher identified.
<u>ED # 1107.08(a)</u>	1 file had no regular education teacher identified.
<u>ED # 1123.03(a4)</u>	1 file had no record of disclosure.
<u>ED # 1125.(b1)</u>	2 files had no Written Prior Notice.
<u>ED # 1109.03(b)</u>	1 file: Did not have appropriate membership.

**SUGGESTIONS:** None



**SCHOOL:** *Newport Middle School*

**PROGRAM(S):** All

**SPEDIS # OF FILES:** (1) 479212 (2) 529334 (3) 559053 (4) 532715 (5) 532268

**COMMENDATIONS:**

- Concerns from the 1992 on-site evaluation have been addressed.
- Efforts in placing special education students in regular classrooms has been thorough and initially successful.
- Teachers and administrators are committed to all students.
- EH program is moving in a positive direction and is looking to reintegrate students into the regular classroom.

**CITATIONS:**

<u>ED # 1107.03(a)</u>	Evaluation team lacking certified teacher of suspected disability.
<u>ED # 1107.05(h)</u>	1 file had no 45 day extension for testing.
<u>ED # 1107.07(b)</u>	1 file lacked teacher of disability and LEA representative.
<u>ED # 1107.08(a)</u>	No regular education teacher in evaluation team meeting.
<u>ED # 1107.08(d)</u>	3 files had no specific statement that the team determined the disability didn't occur because of environmental, cultural or economic disadvantage.
<u>ED # 1109.01(g)</u>	1 file forgot to fill in the date.
<u>ED # 1109.01(n)</u>	1 file was unclear as to whether parent approved or disapproved IEP.
<u>ED # 1115.04(b)</u>	There was no current statement of least restrictive environment.
<u>ED # 1123.03(a,b)</u>	1 file there was no record of access sheet.

**SUGGESTIONS:** Additional training for inclusion and modifying curriculum is needed for all teachers.

**SCHOOL:** *Newport High School*

**PROGRAM(S):** (1) EH Program (2) H.S. Resource Room (3) Multi-Occupations

**SPEDIS # OF FILES:** (1) 547542 (2) 559023 (3) 479005 (4) 479238 (5) 460071

**COMMENDATIONS:**

- There is willingness and the ability to individualize programs and curriculum and to make accommodations for students. The special programs (e.g. alternative and parallel curriculums) that are available provide many opportunities.
- The special education staff is enthusiastic and collaborates effectively with the administration and the regular education staff.
- The Sugar River Valley Regional Vocational Center provides an excellent opportunity that has been open to special education students.

**CITATIONS:**

<u>ED # 1107.2(b)</u>	2 files lacked written notice to parents when referral came from other than parent.
<u>ED # 1107.2(d)</u>	1 file lacked written notice to parents of disposition of referral.
<u>ED # 1107.07(b)</u>	1 file lacked the qualified examiner in the suspected disability area.
<u>ED # 1125.(b1)</u>	1 file lacked evidence of Written Prior Notice.
<u>ED # 1113.01(a)</u>	1 file lacked a vocational evaluation that was necessary.
<u>ED # 1109.01(g)</u>	1 file lacked the projected dates for an IEP.
<u>ED # 1102.35</u>	1 file did not adequately specify the objectives and experiences for the transition statement.
<u>ED # 1109.03(b1-8)</u>	1 file did not specify the roles of the individuals on the IEP development team.
<u>ED # 1109.04(a)</u>	1 file lacked parental notice of an IEP meeting.
<u>#34CFR3000.307</u>	4 files lacked statements regarding physical education.

**SUGGESTIONS:** We suggest that a record of disclosure be maintained with the special education records as well as in the guidance office.

**SCHOOL:** *Sunapee Central School*

**PROGRAM(S):** Resource Room

**SPEDIS # OF FILES:** (1) 522608 (2) 522612 (3) 559040

**COMMENDATIONS:**

- There are strong inclusionary programs with consideration for individual needs and LRE guidelines.
- There is evidence of good communication among staff, parents and administration as well as with students.
- There is a very positive atmosphere in the building with strong teaming.
- Individualization is not restricted to special needs students.
- Staff and students have access to good technology.
- Strong parental involvement in building is evident, especially, parents are very involved in IEP development process.
- School psychologist is an integral involvement with teams.

**CITATIONS:**

<u>ED # 1107.02(b)</u>	1 file had no documentation of referrals.
<u>ED # 1107.03(c)</u>	1 file had no academic performance assessment conducted.
<u>ED # 1107.05(h)</u>	In 1 file, the evaluation was not completed within 45 days. No extension agreement was found in file.
<u>ED # 1107.07(b4)</u>	1 file had no LEA signature or evaluation summary.
<u>ED # 1107.08(c,d)</u>	1 file had no observation documented. No LEA signature on report.
<u>ED # 1125.(b1)</u>	3 files had no evidence of Written Prior Notice.
<u>ED # 1109.04(a)</u>	1 file had no notification of IEP meeting.
<u>ED # 1111.01(a,b)</u>	1 file had no documentation of Extended School Year consideration.

**SUGGESTIONS:**

- Concern was raised by the team about space limitations for next year. There is a need for quiet space for special education programs.
- There is a need for clerical support for special education resource room teacher has a large caseload and is the only full time staff person who can coordinate teams. Needs help with paperwork.
- More time and money needed to access resources (eg., academic materials and methods appropriate for special education students), parenting classes, etc.
- When students leave the district, procedures should be followed to send special education files on after discharging student from services.
- Special education caseload seems high for one teacher.

**SCHOOL:** *Sunapee Middle/High School*

**PROGRAM(S):** All

**SPEDIS # OF FILES:** (1) 516924 (2) 529268 (3)532748

**COMMENDATIONS:**

- Student files in excellent order.
- Separate "working" files are monitored by special education teacher and are signed off by all teachers involved with student.
- There is sense of pride and strong teamwork within the school.
- The building administrator is actively involved in the special education process.
- All staff are highly dedicated professionals with exceptional skills.

**CITATIONS:**

ED # 1102.35 1 file had no transition plan not included in the student's IEP.

**SUGGESTIONS:** None

**SCHOOL:**                    ***Goshen-Lempster (K-8)***

**PROGRAM(S):**    (1) Resource Room    (2) SAFE (EH)

**SPEDIS # OF FILES:**    (1) 547522    (2) 559024    (3) 532705

**COMMENDATIONS:**

- All Staff are knowledgeable and skilled in working with special needs students. Strong effort to meet individual needs of students is evident.
- Continuum of services available allows for services of varying and multiple handicaps. Also allows the building to separate resources for behavior and learning needs in a way which benefits both special education and regular education programs.
- Staff work well together and have good communication.
- Monitoring, tracking and planning systems are well developed and utilized.
- Special needs students very much integrated building-wide.
- Sped teacher caseload is manageable, and teachers feel supported.
- Great rapport between staff and principal is evident.
- Sharing support staff with Sunapee works well and is acceptable to staff.

**CITATIONS:**

<u>ED # 1107.02(b,d)</u> 1103.02(f2)	3 files had no written notice of referral. No written notice to parent of referral within 15 days.
<u>ED # 1107.03(c,i)</u>	1 file had no academic assessment or current evaluation form.
<u>ED # 1107.05(h)</u>	1 file had no evidence of evaluation completed 45 days, no signed extension.
<u>ED # 1107.07(b1)</u>	2 files evaluation team did not include teacher certified in suspected disability area (MR).
<u>ED # 1107.07 (b2)</u>	No qualified examiner in suspected disability area. No evaluation information found in 1 file.
<u>ED #1107.07 (b4)</u>	3 files had no LEA representative at evaluation meeting.
<u>ED # 1107.08(c,d)</u>	1 file had no observations. No written report found. (all reports unavailable)
<u>ED # 1125.(b1)</u>	2 files had no evidence of Written Prior Notice.
<u>ED # 1129.05(e)</u>	1 file: ASP not signed.
<u>ED # 1109.03(b1)</u>	3 files: No LEA representative present.
<u>ED # 1111.01(a,b)</u>	2 files had no evidence EYP considered.

**SUGGESTIONS:**

- Principal needs to attend more Special Ed. staffings and sign as attending.
- Improve computer technology in building and especially in Resource Room.
- Increase access to Integration Specialist who seems to be well liked and whose services seem to be much appreciated.
- More training of regular education staff, particularly at higher grade levels in understanding working with and adapting for special needs students.
- There is a need for clerical staff to relieve special education professional staff from spending time on paperwork, especially since a backlog was created while position was vacant.

## SUMMARY

**SCHOOL:** *Out-of-District*

**SPEDIS # OF FILES:** (1) 522629 (2) 1523533

**COMMENDATIONS:** The SAU makes a strong effort to provide programming for students in the least restrictive environment.

### **CITATIONS:**

<u>ED # 1107.02(b,d)</u> <u>1103.02(f2)</u>	Neither file had evidence of any referral information or consent to evaluate.
<u>ED # 1107.03(a)</u>	2 files lacked evidence that multi-disciplinary team met criteria.
<u>ED #1107.03(i)</u>	1 file had no evidence of current evaluation.
<u>ED # 1107.05(a,k)</u>	1 file: Unable to determine if qualified examiner was appropriate or if the evaluation was completed within time limits.
<u>ED # 1107.06(c)</u>	1 file lacked evidence that SEE/PT team was appropriately composed.
<u>ED # 1123.05(a,b)</u>	2 files had no evidence that parents were given annual notice of rights.
<u>ED # 1125.03(d)</u>	2 files had no evidence of written prior notice with the four criteria.
<u>ED # 1109.01(a-l)</u>	1 file the IEP had not been signed by parent.
<u>ED # 1102.35</u>	1 file had no evidence of transition planning.
<u>ED # 1109.03(b)</u>	1 file had no evidence that IEP team was appropriate.
<u>ED # 1109.04(a)</u>	1 file had no written notice of IEP meeting to parent.
<u>34CFR3000.307</u>	Neither IEP reviewed had any mention of physical education.
<u>ED # 1111.01(a,b)</u>	2 files had no evidence that extended school year was considered.
<u>ED # 1115.03(a-g)</u>	1 file had no evidence that placement team had appropriate membership.
<u>ED # 1115.04(b)</u>	1 file had no evidence that Least Restrictive Environment was considered annually.

# **JAMES O. COMPLIANCE REVIEW**

**SAU # 43**

## **JAMES O. COMPLIANCE REVIEW**

**SPEDIS # OF  
FILES REVIEWED:** 547533

### **COMMENDATIONS:**

- The Special Education Director makes a strong effort to monitor programs and maintain active involvement in each child's education.

### **CITATIONS:**

<u>ED # 1107.02(d)</u>	No record of written consent to evaluate.
<u>ED # 1107.03(a)</u>	Unable to determine if evaluation team was multidisciplinary.
<u>ED #1107.05(k)</u>	Unable to determine if evaluation was completed within time limits due to the fact permission was not signed or dated.
<u>ED # 1107.06(a)</u>	File had no evaluation summary report.
<u>ED # 1107.07(c)</u>	File had no minutes of evaluation team meeting indicating that there was appropriate team composition.
<u>ED #1113.01(a-c)</u>	Student was being considered for vocational education yet there was no vocational evaluation completed or scheduled.
<u>ED # 1109.01(L)</u>	Transition plan did not meet requirements as outlined in state standards.
<u>ED # 1111.01</u>	There was no evidence of consideration of extended school year.
<u>ED # 1123.01(L)</u>	No record of written prior notice.
<u>ED # 1130.03 (d)</u>	No record that the LEA team convened and considered requirements outlined 1130.03.
<u>ED # 1130.04(a-d)</u>	No record that emergency meeting was held.



**SUMMARY  
"CHAPTER 402"  
REIMBURSEMENT CLAIMS**

**SPEDIS # of**

**Files Reviewed:**        (1) 547533      (2) 516089      (3) 532289

Three student records were reviewed and found to be in compliance with all required documentation.